THE WILMINGTON JOURNAL

WILMINGTON, N. C.,

FRIDAY, APRIL 28, 1871.

West Virginia.

An election was held in West Virginia yesterday for the ratification or rejection of a proposed amendment to the State Constitution, which has been under consideration for more than two years past. The proposed amendment removes political disabilities on account of color or participation in the late civil war.

If it should be adopted, and there seems to be little doubt in regard to it, several thousand citizens, disfranchised because they were Confederate soldiers and sympathizers, will be allowed to vote who have not done so since the war. In this event, West Virginia, like Missouri, would become one of the most reliable Democratic States in the Union.

An Imperial Visitor.

It is announced at the Russian Embassy that his Imperial Highness the Grand Duke Alexis, third son of the reigning Czar, Alexander II, of Russia, will visit this country about the first of July, and appropriate steps are being taken by the State Department and the diplomatic corps to extend a cheerful welcome. The Grand Duke is now but a little over twenty-one years of age, and is thoroughly devoted to his profession as an officer of the Russian navy. He will leave Cronstadt early in June, in an imperial yacht, accompanied by an escort of four or five vessels, and after receptions at New York and Washington on his arrival, will make a tour of the Eastern, Middle and Western States, and probably return home by way of San Francisco and Asia.

Judge Russell.

The Raleigh *Sentinel* says it learns that Judge Russell intends to resign for the purpose of running for the Convention, with the understanding that Governor Caldwell is to re-appoint him afterwards. We have not heard of this before, but we could see Judge Russell resign with considerable patience, even should he never return to the bench. We are satisfied that his continued retirement would not injure the reputation of the bench for legal lore.

But with this we have nothing to do. Judge Russell may or may not resign. He is the Judge of this District, and so long as he remains in office and proves worthy of it, all the respect due his official position should be shown him. But the following extract from the *Sentinel* is worthy the attention of the public. It says:

> Judge Russell has not been to Sampson county for two years, as we are informed, because of threatening letters received from that portion of his judicial vineyard. Judge Buxton, who is not afraid of the devil, and has more courage than Logan, Russell, Holden and Abbott all combined, has held court for Judge Russell in this Ku-Klux county (so called).
>
> Judges like Logan and Russell, who are afraid to hold court in their own circuit, are not fit advisers of the people. If they were ever so wise and entertained political views good for the country, a threat, a slight menace would be sufficient to drive them from their plans and purposes.

Now if this be the true condition of affairs, and as Sampson Court is soon to convene, we hope the good people of that county will, like those of Cleveland, offer to escort Judge Russell to Clinton, and be his body guard during his stay. Judge Russell dwelt considerably upon the terrors of the Sampson county Ku-Klux in his testimony before the Senate "Outrage" Committee—in fact he gives his opinion as to their certain existence in three and probably in every county of his judicial district except Brunswick and Columbus—but we did not know that he stood in personal dread himself. If he does he has had the discretion not to boast of it as Judge Logan has done, as if it was a matter to be proud of.

We hope, however, that our Raleigh cotemporary is mistaken about this matter. Surely a Judge who is afraid to hold Court ought to resign whether he wants to run for the Convention or not.

The Judiciary and Crimes.

We publish elsewhere a letter from a gentleman well known throughout North Carolina, addressed to Senator BLAIR, in regard to the recent conduct of Judge Logan, and the cowardly falsehoods he reported in Washington in regard to the condition of affairs in Cleveland county. The object of this falsifier and dastard was palpable. The Ku-Klux and the Amnesty bills were both pending in Congress, and Governor VANCE'S chances of admission to the Senate were very promising. The account given in the letter corresponds fully with that heretofore published *in extenso* in the Salisbury *Old North State*.

It appears that Judge Logan dispatched his messenger post-haste, avowedly to Raleigh to see Governor Caldwell, who, it was well known, was at his home in Morganton, within a few hours' ride of Judge Logan. But the messenger neither stopped in Raleigh to await the Governor's return nor sought him at Morganton, but hastened to Washington City to have the cowardly slanders and falsehoods read in the Senate, to affect the pending legislation.

Just such cowardice and partisanship on the part of our Judges have caused a very large proportion of the disorders in North Carolina. The Tourgees, Logans, Wattses and Joneses of our Bench have been the chief promoters of the outrages perpetrated by the Loyal Leagues and the Ku-Klux. And we fear that disorders, in one shape or another, will continue until respect for the civil law is engendered among our people, by a returning confidence in the integrity, ability and courage of our Judges. If the Legislature had "persuaded" other Judges to resign besides Judge Jones, the benefits could hardly be overestimated. It is the height of folly to talk about peace and order when the very executors of the law are themselves the chief promoters of disorder and lawlessness. It is useless to advise good men to seek redress for wrongs in the Courts if they are satisfied that the Judges are corrupt partisans.

We are no apologists for crime. We have and will continue to denounce lawlessness wherever it exists. We shall use our best efforts to prevent it, and bring the criminals to justice. But we desire, also to see the active, official agents of these disorders punished. We want men having in their keeping the well-being of society, who use such important trusts to serve selfish and partisan purposes to the detriment of the public, to be held to a strict responsibility for their base conduct. We venture nothing in saying that judicial crimes have done more to injure North Carolina than the Loyal Leagues and Ku-Klux combined—indeed, the corruption of our Judges has been the fruitful source of lawlessness and crime upon the part of these two secret organizations.

Paper Legal Tender Money Constitutional.

The Supreme Court of the United States has decided that the legal-tender act is constitutional, overruling the decision of last year, which declared that contracts for the payment of money made before the passage of the legal-tender act could not be paid in green-backs and must be paid in gold.

The decision of last year was illogical—that just made is logical. If the Government has authority to make anything else than gold and silver coin a legal-tender in the payment of debts, and it makes paper money issued by itself a legal tender, that paper money becomes, to all intents and purposes, as efficient in the payment of debts as gold and silver coin; and it can make no difference whether the debt was contracted before or after the time when the Government made paper money issued by itself a legal-tender. Gold and silver coin is not a legal-tender until made so by Government authority, and paper currency is not a legal-tender no more than is gold and silver coin unless made so by the Government.

The only question is the authority of the Government in the premises. If the authority be once conceded, then the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States just made is correct and logical. The authority conceded, the Congress can issue stamped paper—not promises to pay, like the present greenbacks—and make that stamped paper a legal tender, the same as it can make gold pieces, stamped and marked by the Government, legal tender in the payment of debts. Both are such by virtue of Government authority only. Everything depends upon the authority. The Court rules that the authority exists; hence there is no distinction between gold legal-tenders and paper legal-tenders.

WOULD IT NOT be advisable, in view of the contemplated visit of the Congressional Committee appointed to investigate the alleged Ku-Klux outrages in the South, to probe these Ku-Klux stories put afloat by Radicals to the bottom, by summoning before our grand juries all the leading Northern men, all the Radical officials, national, State and municipal, including members of the Legislature, and Radical editors, to testify what they know about these alleged Ku-Klux crimes. North Carolina has suffered much by the evidence of her judges, solicitors, sheriffs and other officials before the Senate Outrage Committee. They all agree that the grand juries are at fault for the escape of the criminals—that true bills will not be presented against them. Why not, as they all speak with such absolute certainty of the existence of the Ku-Klux and their criminal acts, have them summoned before the grand juries, especially in those counties in which they say men cannot exercise their rights of citizenship, and that life and property of "Unionists" and negroes are not safe.

For instance, Judge Russell says in his evidence that he is certain that in his district the Ku-Klux have an existence in Sampson, Duplin and Robeson, and thinks they have in New Hanover and Bladen. That in Sampson and Duplin, as well as Anson, Cumberland and a few other counties in the State their organization is so powerful and terrible that citizens are not only outraged, but that many are deterred from voting and many forced to vote against their opinions. Now if Judge Russell should be unwilling to call the attention of the grand juries to those matters in his public charge it is perfectly competent for him to go before them as a witness, and under the seal of secrecy enjoined by their oaths of office, to put them in full possession of all the information he may have. As a sworn conservator of the peace it is his plain duty to do so. The oath taken by the grand juror to keep secret his own, the State's and his fellow's counsel, was designed to meet just such a condition of affairs as Judge Russell alleges to exist.

What we say in regard to Judge Russell applies as well to Judges Settle, Logan Henry, Solicitors Lusk and Bulla, Sheriff Lee, and other peace officers who have testified so abundantly in regard to the disorders in North Carolina. By all means, let grand juries summon these and other officials before them. Let us investigate this matter thoroughly. Grand juries owe it to themselves to disprove these slanders in regard to their faithlessness and disregard of their oath.

We are satisfied that in no instance in North Carolina have grand juries failed to present true bills when proper and sufficient evidence has been presented. It seems that these peace officers who know so much in regard to these crimes, have failed to report them to the proper tribunals. Now let the grand juries seek them and get from them all they know. Let them sift the matter thoroughly, and see how much of this evidence is based upon positive knowledge, and how much of it is political hearsay, gathered from ignorant negroes, false newspaper reports, and the stale falsehoods of political mendicants, who slander our people for their own selfish purposes.

Letter from Judge Russell.

APRIL 28, 1871.

Editor Journal:—If you are disposed to do justice, you will publish this, my answer to the charge which you have copied from a Raleigh paper, to the effect that I am afraid to hold Court in Sampson county. It is false that I have not held Court in Sampson for two years. I have not presided there for the last two terms, having last Spring exchanged that county with Judge Buxton, and last Fall we exchanged half of our respective circuits. It is true that I did once receive a threatening letter while holding Court in that county, but so little importance did I attach to it that I am sure I have never mentioned it to more than four persons, and I am quite convinced that they have not spoken of it.—It would have been rather late in the day for me to be frightened at Ku-Klux letters, in as much as I had many before that time containing the same kind of threats. I will not trespass upon your columns by refuting the other erroneous intimations and misrepresentations contained in the same article. If I and others were to undertake to answer everything of that character which appears in partisan newspapers, we would subject ourselves to very great labor and inconvenience—in fact it would be impracticable, and the game would not be worth the candle. I will suggest, however, that by examination and reference, you will see that in one particular you have misstated what I have said, and in another thrown out an intimation totally unauthorized.

Not entertaining any special fear about going to any county, I shall hold the Courts whenever required to do so by law, and will probably hold the Court of that county if I see proper to remain on the bench.

Yours, &c.,

DAN. L. RUSSELL, JR.

REMARKS.

We are always glad to do justice to those whose public course we feel called upon to criticize. Indeed, without such a disposition, we would have but a poor opinion of our own comments. We publish the above letter with pleasure.

So far as we may have misstated in one particular or thrown out any unauthorized intimation in regard to the Judge's testimony, we shall let the public decide, as we shall publish all the material portions of the evidence of Judge Russell before the Senate "Outrage" Committee in a day or two.

If our Judges could forget that they were partisans themselves, they would have less cause to answer attacks from "partisan" newspapers.

Judge Russell.

We publish this morning, at considerable length, extracts from the testimony of this public functionary, before the Outrage Committee at Washington City, that our readers may see the representations he makes as to the condition of affairs in our own State.

We have had occasion more than once, and specially in reference to the late troubles in North Carolina, to speak not unkindly of Judge Russell. Feeling assured that those troubles, at least in the central portion of the State, arose from the want of confidence justly created by the conduct, judicial and otherwise, of Judge Tourgee, we went so far as to suggest an exchange of circuits between Judge Tourgee and Judge Russell, as a remedy that would restore to a healthy condition the disordered state of affairs then and there prevailing. We did this because we thought Judge Russell, though too young and inexperienced, too little learned in the law to make an able judge, had shown by his withdrawal from active participation in partisan strife, that he had a correct appreciation of judicial propriety, and because we thought that having been born and reared in the State, and that being identified in blood and affection, as well as in interest, with the people upon whom all hope of future preferment and reputation depend, he would at least be a faithful and unbiased Judge.

We knew that it was not to be expected that the legal opinions and judical utterance of a mere youth, even if he possessed strong natural abilities, whose whole span of life had barely exceeded twenty brief summers, should be equal to those of a Ruffin or a Badger, but we did have hope that youth and inexperience would be no bar to a faithful, bold and zealous discharge of the duties of his high office.

We hoped he was so well satisfied, that to "act well his part" as Judge was the surest road to honor and preferment, that for this, if for no other reason, he would refuse utterly to drag the judicial ermine in the political mire in which his party friends were floundering.

We had not then before us the example of John Pool.

The spectacle of a native son of Carolina unblushingly maligning, traducing and slandering our good old State, had not then made us realize fully the fact that continued affiliation with the radical party was utterly inconsistent with proper feeling and proper conduct.

We have been disappointed in Judge Russell. After reading the sworn statements made before the Outrage Committee, we feel sure our readers will agree with us that he has not come up to the full measure of his duty as a sworn Conservator of the Peace.

It is not our purpose to enquire into the cause of this failure to perform his manifest duty, further than to recall to the recollection of our readers that on yesterday we published a letter from the Judge disclaiming "any special fear" in the premises. Our only purpose now is to inquire whether or not the Judge has, upon his own showing, been vigilant in taking proper precautionary measures to preserve the peace, or has been active in taking proper steps to secure the detection and punishment of the violators thereof, and in this enquiry it is material to bear in mind that the Judge does not entertain "any special fear." This fact would seem to have fitted him peculiarly for the position he occupied and ought to have rendered his duty an easy one. There might be some palliation for failure to perform duty on the part of officers who lived under the reign of terror that his Honor swears existed, and who were cognizant of the want of security for life and liberty and property that attached to an avowal of union proclivities or a partiality for the Federal Government. Even now it seems to us His Honor will be derelict in leaving the Bench, a possibility to which he alludes, for the reason that he is so well fitted to calm the troubled sea of discontent, or rather to destroy that reign of terror that, according to His Honor, still existed at the time he made his sworn statement.

If His Honor be correct in his sworn opinion that the state of things he testified to still existed, was "just as bad now as it ever was," it is high time to put an end to this carnival of crime, and we are indeed fortunate in having in the person of the highest judicial functionary in the District an officer who is not under "any special fear." In this view of the case it would seem to be his plain duty to remain upon the bench, for the reason that his successor may not be so indifferent to so many threatening letters as His Honor declares himself to be. We think the Judge was right in not being afraid because of these letters, nor indeed do we think any upright Judge had any ground for apprehension because of a bold, fearless discharge of his whole duty.

We wish we could express an unqualified approbation of His Honor in other respects, or rather, that his conduct had been such as to merit it. We would prefer that he had felt enough interest in so grave a matter as to be able to remember whether or not he had directed the "particular attention" of the Grand Jury to so foul a murder as that he alleges was committed in Sampson, and his, too, in the face of the fact that it attracted his own "particular attention" sufficiently to induce him to "trouble himself to inquire privately of negroes and with one or two Union men in that county" in regard thereto. The Judge blames Grand Juries for failure to do their duty. The censure would come far more appropriately from one who had been more active in the detection and punishment of the murderers of a "colored man who was said to have been a prominent gentleman and Republican in the county."

If the highest judicial officer manifests an indifference to the performance of his public duties, we respectfully submit that he is estopped, as the lawyers say, from censuring his subordinates for being also indifferent. If, as the Judge swears, "in nine cases out of ten the men who commit the crimes constitute or sit in the Grand Jury, when they themselves, or their near relatives or friends, sympathisers, aiders or abettors," it would seem to have been the especial duty of a Judge, who did not entertain "any special fear," at least to have made their failure and his own performance of duty palpable.

A like indifference was manifested in regard to the outrage in Cumberland last December, committed while His Honor was holding Court. His Honor swore that he had information from "a person who was entirely reliable," that the victim of the outrage was in the same town with him and could swear to two of the perpetrators, and yet, strange to say, knowing the reign of terror that existed and the alleged unwillingness of victims to testify, he took no steps to have the man brought before the grand jury, where he could be compelled to testify. Instead of this he contented himself with sending a message to the man, a proceeding that he had no right, if a reign of terror actually existed, to expect to end otherwise than in the disappearance of the witness! It would have been better for the Judge, and far better for the people, had he not been contented so often with "troubling himself" to act "privately."

"Not entertaining any special fear," we can see no palliation for his failure to "trouble himself" publicly. We must defer further comment to another day.

JUDGE RUSSELL.

EXTRACTS FROM HIS TESTIMONY BEFORE THE SENATE "OUTRAGE" COMMITTEE.

After the usual questions and answers as to the residence and occupation of the witness, Judge Russell gave an account of the troubles in Robeson county. The examination then proceeded as follows:

Question—Is there any other portion of your district in which there has been any disturbance of the public peace?

Answer—There have been crimes committed in some of the counties—in at least two of them, to my knowledge; and I have reason to believe that in one of them, at least, they were political.

Question—Which county is that?

Answer—Sampson.

Question—What was the character of that?

Answer—The most striking instance I have heard of was that of a colored man, who was said to have been a prominent gentleman and republican in the county, who was called out to his door just after dark, and shot dead by a party of men at the fence. That occurred in the year 1868, immediately after or during the presidential campaign. There has been no indictment, and, so far as I have been informed, no attempt to indict. That occurred within a short distance of the county town, almost within the corporate limits.

Question—Were the men in disguise who committed the offense?

Answer—I have never heard that they were. I took the trouble myself to inquire privately of negroes, and with one or two Union men in that county, if they knew anything about the facts connected with that murder. The invariable answer was, if they had any knowledge it would not be safe for them to reveal it.

Question—Was it the subject of investigation before any magistrate?

Answer—I never heard that it was.—Whether it was before a coroner's jury or not, I cannot say. It is usual to have such a jury, and the usual verdict in such a case is, death by some person unkown to the jury. Whether an inquest took place in that case, I do not remember. There has been no presentment or indictment before the grand jury.

Question—Was the occurrence given in charge to the jury to investigate?

Answer—The occurrence was given in common with all other offences against the criminal law in the county. I do not recollect whether particular attention was directed to that murder or not. It was well known in the community, and the grand jury knew it as well as anybody else; that is, the fact that the murder had occurred.

Question—What was the political complexion of that county and its officers?

Answer—Democratic.

Question—In cases arising out of injuries alleged to have been inflicted by this secret, disguised organization, do you believe that there is any difficulty in the administration of justice in the courts in consequence of the existence of the organization?

Answer—Well, I do not remember that there has been any indictment in any court over which I have presided against these masked marauders. I have a very decided opinion on that question, but I cannot speak from any positive personal observation.

Question—We would be glad to have your opinion, as a judicial officer of the county, of the state of things in your district?

Answer—Do you desire me to speak specially with reference to my district, or elsewhere in the State?

Question—Elsewhere in the State, if your information is such as to have formed an opinion upon it?

Answer—Well, sir, my information extends over most of the State, for I have taken the trouble to inform myself in respect to at least two-thirds of the State where these depredations have occurred, and from what I consider reliable authority, my opinion is very decided that it is utterly impossible to secure anything like a fair trial in any case where any person belongs to any of these secret organizations or clans, Constitutional Union Guards, &c.; utterly impossible in any such case to obtain a fair trial on the part of the State. In the first place, it is difficult to procure a bill of indictment through the grand jury. In nine cases out of ten the men who commit the crimes constitute or sit on the grand jury, either they themselves or their near relatives or friends, sympathizers, aiders, or abettors; and, if a bill is found, it is next to impossible to secure a conviction upon a trial at the bar. I have heard of no instance in North Carolina where a conviction of that sort has taken place.

Question—Does that difficulty arise from the presence of members of the organization on the jury, or from the appearance of witnesses in behalf of the organization, or both?

Answer—From both, so far as my information goes.

Question—To what extent is that the case in the State at present; in how many counties or districts that you are aware of?

Answer—Well, sir, my opinion is that it is the case in every county where these organizations have been introduced. They have not been introduced in all the counties, so far as my observation goes. For instance, in my own district, I am sure there are at least two counties where they have never been introduced at all, and one of these is a very strong democratic county.

Question—Name them.

Answer—Columbus and Brunswick.

Question—How as to other counties of the district?

Answer—Well, sir, I speak merely from information. My opinion is it does exist in at least three counties in the district. The other three I am in doubt whether it does or not; at any rate, I have never seen any evidence in the other three in the jury-box.

Question—What three does it exist in?

Answer—Duplin, Sampson and Robeson. There have been no outrages by that order in Robeson. Well, there have been some, I have no doubt, but none very flagrant; I do not know but I did hear of their killing one man. I believe the organization exists in those three counties?

Question—Do I understand you, then, as saying that in cases which come to your court arising out of this political organization, your belief is that justice cannot be administered through the medium of jury trial?

Answer—That is my decided opinion.

Question—From your experience as a judicial officer there, can you suggest to us any practical legislative remedy for this evil?

Answer—Well, sir, that raises numerous constitutional questions, many of which I have not examined. I did say, and I say now, that two years ago, or even one year ago, if we had had a competent government, competent legislature, and competent executive, it could have been suppressed by the State authorities by the State courts, and that its final triumph is due, in a great measure, to the incapacity of those who have been intrusted with the administration of our governmental affairs in the State.

Question—Do you speak of the inefficient administration of the civil code itself, or the failure of legislation?

Answer—I speak in the first place of the failure of the legislature to afford the necessary remedies in criminal prosecution, their partial failure to do that; and second, the utter failure of the executive to carry into effect such remedies as were given by the legislature.

Question—You mean by that the act which authorized the Governor to use the military?

Answer—No, sir; I do not mean that. I mean the acts of assembly which gave him authority to push the prosecution in the courts. For instance, there was an act of assembly which authorized the removal, at the instance of the State, of cases after a bill was found, from a county where a fair trial could not be had, to a forum, to be selected by the State. That was entirely unconstitutional. The legislature had a perfect right to do it. There were numerous bills of indictment found, with evidence sufficient in some counties. I am entirely satisfied, but there was an utter failure on the part of the Governor to employ counsel and prosecute those cases by removing them to such forums as would have afforded a fair trial; in consequence of which no convictions were had.

Question—Was that duty imposed upon the Governor or upon the district solicitor?

Answer—I do not remember that in so many words the Governor was required to do it, but he was making pretense of putting down the Ku-klux. He had a secret service fund at his disposal, was employing detectives all over the State, and in some instances employed counsel. The solicitors in the circuits did not make the motion, and the Governor had nobody there to insist upon it.

* * * * * *

Question—To what extent does this state of affairs to which you have testified exist at this time in the State?

Answer—I think it is just as bad now as ever it was. While holding court, in December last, in Cumberland county, which is out of my circuit—I exchanged circuits with Judge Buxton—I had reliable information that a white man was taken out of town, within the vicinity of Fayetteville, in that county, and severely whipped and scourged; the reason given being that he had voted the radical ticket?

Question—Do you recollect his name?

Answer—Raiford.

Question—Was any judicial investigation instituted?

Answer—None whatever. Information was brought to me, at my rooms, that the man was in town, and I told the gentleman who brought it to tell him to come and see me. The statement was also made that he knew two of the men.

Question—Was this statement made by the man who was injured?

Answer—No, but by the party who came to see me. He said the man who was injured was in town. I asked the gentleman if the man could swear to any of the parties. The answer was that he could swear to two of them. I then told the gentleman to go and bring the man to my room that night, for the purpose of making an affidavit, so that I could issue a bench warrant. He did not come, but sent me word by the same party that he could not make an affidavit; that he feared he would be killed if he did. I heard that night that he could not be found. If he had appeared before me at all, it would have been compulsory, and I could not compel him to make an affidavit.

Question—From your observations and travels through the State, in the exercise of your official functions, what is your belief as to the effect produced upon public security by these outrages that have been committed?

Answer—Well, sir, I think, in those counties where these outrages have taken place, and the public have seen that they have been done with impunity, there is an absolute reign of terror, and there is no sort of security to either life, liberty or property in favor of any man against whom there is reasonable suspicion that he is a Union man and favorable to the Government.

By Mr. Blair:

Question—What are your political opinions?

Answer—I am a republican. I was born in North Carolina; was in the Confederate army; was a large slaveholder; and am now a considerable tax-payer and property-holder, and entirely identified with the people and interests of the State of North Carolina.

Question—You do not profess to speak of these outrages of your own knowledge at all, only from general opinion?

Answer—No, sir; of course I have seen none of them committed.

Question—You say you are not a member of the Loyal League?

Answer—I am not.

Question—What is the purpose of that organization, so far as you know?

Answer—So far as I know, the purpose of it was to form an organization in the interest of the republican party. I have understood, in fact I have been told by one of the leaders of the league in the State, that there has been no attempt to organize it for more than twelve months past. There have been no meetings, that I am aware of, during that time. When it was first organized and was in progress, in the campaign of 1868, its meetings were well known. The negroes were assembled on my plantation and in that vicinity going to the meetings.

* * * * * *

Question—Did the establishment of this Loyal League precede the establishment of what is known as the Ku klux and other organizations?

Answer—Well, the Loyal League was known in North Carolina before there was any public attention directed to what is now called the Ku-klux-klan; but the introduction of the Loyal League in North Carolina was contemporaneous with the organization of the republican party in the State, which took place in 1867. By that time there had been numbers of outrages committed in the State by persons who called themselves regulators, and whose principal purpose seemed to be to break up the negroes, prevent them from owning or renting lands, or owning horses or other property, and whose depredations were confined entirely to negroes. I heard of no instance of outraging white Union men. Those depredations were committed very extensively, and many of them in the immediate vicinity of one of my plantations. The negroes' mules were taken and carried off, so that no negro would undertake to own a mule or a horse or a piece of land, and a great many of them will not now.

Question—You say you were in the Confederate army?

Answer—Yes, sir.

Question—Originally a secessionist?

Answer—Well, sir, I entered the Confederate army when I was fifteen or sixteen years old. I was not a secessionist; I do not think I had any political opinion of any sort very decided. I am only twenty-five now. I went in about 1862, and staid there a year or two. My education and all my instincts were against secession. My family were opposed to secession.

Question—You say you have heard the charge made by democratic newspapers, and I suppose by democrats generally, that this Union League was established for the purpose of intimidating and threatening the negroes and preventing them from voting the democratic ticket?

Answer—Yes, sir, I said democratic newspapers, because really that is about the only source from which I have ever got any such information. I do not know that I have ever heard it from a public speaker or ever heard the charge made in private conversation.

Question—Do you know what is the public debt of the State?

Answer—Very large, brought about by very reckless and corrupt legislation in my opinion.

Question—About how much is it?

Answer—I suppose about $33,000,000 or $34,000,000.

Question—What was it before the war?

Answer—About $15,000,000 or $16,000,000.

Question—That is what is called the "late-war debt" with the interest accumulated?

Answer—Yes, sir.

Question—How do you say this addition was brought about?

Answer—I think by the corrupt and reckless legislation in 1868 and 1869.

Question—Was that the legislature elected under the reconstruction act?

Answer—Yes, sir, and by the republican party.

Question—Has the State received any benefit at all from the additional debt?

Answer—Very little indeed; it was increased $14,000,000 or $15,000,000, and the bonds were put into the hands of swindlers who, in my opinion, have swindled the State.

Question—Who were these men; where did they come from?

Answer—Some of them were natives and some of them were known as carpet-baggers. Of the three principal persons two were natives and one was a carpet-bagger.

Question—What were their names?

Answer—Mr. Jones, Mr. Swepson and General Littlefield. Of course I am speaking very freely and giving my opinion, founded I hope upon sufficient reason.

Question—Is that the public opinion of the State?

Answer—I think it is of all parties now.

Question—Is the Governor supposed to be implicated in the corruption?

Answer—Well, there is a very general public impression to that effect. My own impression, if you want to know it, is this: I have no reason to believe that he is actually guilty of criminal complicity in these frauds, but that much of it, however, is due to his imbecility and incapacity

* * * * * *

By the Chairman:

Question—You have stated two instances in your own circuit, and one in Alamance county, where negroes have been tried and convicted for outrages upon other negroes; do you know of any instances in the State in which members of the Ku-klux organization have been tried and convicted for outrages committed by them?

Answer—I have already said I have never heard of a single instance in all North Carolina.

Question—What is your belief as to the security of the colored people as a class in that State in consequence of the existence of that organization?

Answer—I think they are to be classed with the white Unionists. I think there is no sort of security in those counties where that organization has been introduced and has fully developed itself.

Question—Are you satisfied that the organization exists in military form, so that it could be assembled for co-operation—throughout the State for instance?

Answer—Well, sir, I do not think they have ever contemplated that—that they have never gone that far. I think that at present they are only prepared to meet in secret conclave to decree the death of obnoxious persons, whether white or black, and cause them to be executed, and I am satisfied it has been done in numerous instances.

Question—You mean to say they have not gone that far in purpose?

Answer—No, sir. Not so much in purpose; because I think their purpose goes much further than even that question contemplates. I mean they have not got that far in organization, in development?

Question—Have you any idea of the number of the organization existing in the State?

Answer—Well, I presume that the statement of some of their members, some respectable persons connected with them at one time, is about correct, that there is about 30,000 or 40,000 in the State.

Question—You spoke of the effect in several counties of intimidation on elections; do you know that to have been the case from your intercourse with the people there—that intimidation was used, or that it is now apprehended in case an election is held?

Answer—O, yes, sir. I know it is apprehended, reasonably apprehended, in many counties. It depends much upon the locality, but then they embrace a large number of counties, in my own opinion half of the State.

Question—Has that apprehension the effect of deterring persons from attending the elections?

Answer—I think so, in some instances in others it has the effect of causing them to vote against their sentiments and purpose.

Question—What counties would you indicate in which that state of affairs exist?

Answer—I believe it exists to some extent in Orange, Alamance, Caswell, Chatham, Sampson, Harnett, Person, Rockingham, Anson, Duplin, Cumberland and Moore. I might mention others; these are some of the counties.

Question—I understand from the tenor of your examination that you are directed in your condemnation of the inefficiency of Governor Holden?

Answer—I am; I have frequently said that I think he is responsible. I could have drawn an act of assembly that could have been passed one or two years ago when he had a two-thirds vote at his call which would have suppressed it, provided we had an honest man as executive; and that, too, without infringing the constitutional rights of any man in the State. I think any lawyer who would take the trouble to think about it would have the same thing.

By Mr. Blair:

Question—Could it not be done now?

Answer—I think it could if these conditions could be performed.

Question—Could it not be done by suppressing all these secret societies?

Answer—I think so.

Question—Those that give the protection as well as those charged with committing these outrages?

Answer—I do not think the suppression of secret societies would have any undue effect. In the first place I doubt very much if it is practicable to do it; and in the next place, I have no idea that it would afford any security to those persons who are now insecure.

Question—You have spoken of an occurrence in Fayetteville—a man by the name of Raiford, who was beaten or injured, you did not speak of your own knowledge at all?

Answer—No, sir; I have no doubt about the fact; it is merely up in information; I did not see the man at all.

Question—You only heard of it from another person, who failed to produce the man when you sent for him?

Answer—Yes, sir; but that person was entirely reliable.

Question—Who was he?

Answer—Mr. Riles, formerly sheriff of the county, a truthful man and entirely reliable. Mr. Blocker and Mr. Guthrie, a member of the bar, also told me about it.

Question—Did anybody attempt to interfere with the holding of your court in Fayetteville?

Answer—Not at all.

Question—In any other county?

Answer—Not at all, nor has there ever been such an attempt in North Carolina, and I do not suppose there ever will be from the present condition of things. I have heard of no instance of resistance to process—that is to say, openly. The operations are carried on altogether on a different programme.

Question—Secret?

Answer—Secret; suborning juries and grand juries, and controlling the remedies and administration of justice by that means. It is not necessary for a man to resist a process that carries him before a magistrate who will be certain to discharge him, or before a court that will be certain to acquit him.

Question—The court, as I understand, over which you preside, is generally presided over by republicans?

Answer—Yes; but in nes of fact are generally submitted to the juries.

Question—The juries are summoned by the sheriffs?

Answer—They are summoned indiscriminately there by law. As a general rule, of course, negroes are not competent to sit on juries, and their names are not put on the list—ought not to be in many instances—and Union whites, in those counties where difficulties occur, are largely in the minority.

Question—You say negroes are incompetent to sit on a jury?

Answer—A very large number of them are.

Question—You do not mean incompetent by law?

Answer—O, no, I do not mean that there is any distinction on account of color made by law; but a very large proportion of the negroes have not sufficient intelligence and character to make good jurors; and so, I say, there are a considerable number of whites—of course a larger proportion of negroes than whites. Under our act of assembly the board of county commissioners are the sole judges.—They are compelled to revise the jury list, and all that are deemed incompetent are stricken out.

Question—In what part of the State did you live previously to your residing in Wilmington?

Answer—I was was born in Brunswick county, just over the river from Wilmington, on the south side of Cape Fear River.

Question—You have always lived in that region of the country?

Answer—Always, myself and family. I own property in all three counties, Brunswick, New Hanover and Onslow.

A Pretty Romance—American Officers in Egypt.

A recent letter from Cairo says:

The Viceroy, some years ago, discharged his foreign officers, who were then French, and in their place put ex-American and Confederate Generals. Our General Stone (of Bull's Run) is Chief of Staff. Generals Sibley and Loring (Confederates) have high commands. General Mott, of New York, a son of Dr. Valentine Mott, is attached to the personal staff of the Viceroy. The employment of Americans is attributable to General Mott, or rather to a romantic incident in his life. Some two years ago he met at Constantinople a beautiful Greek girl, who had been educated at our Missionary School in Athens, and fell in love with her; she reciprocated, but her mother was afraid to trust a stranger from a country so remote, and intimated that adventurers had been known to hail from even "the land of the brave." So, when General Mott was absent from the city she took her daughter and fled into Egypt. The General, returning to Cairo, learned whither they had gone, and also the reason of their journey. He immediately sailed for New York, procured testimonials as to his position, character, etc., from persons high in authority and well known abroad, and with them returned to Europe, and proceeded to Cairo, and again met his lady love and her mother. His papers were satisfactory, and they were married. His letters procured him audience with the Viceroy, who was pleased with him, and offered him a commission in his service. He accepted, and through his advice the other American officers were employed.

Mrs. Swann, of Cochran, N. Y., lighted her fire with kerosene on Monday, leaving a husband and one child.

A bachelor friend suggests that in most marriages considerable "soft soap," with strong lye, is used, and the whole operation ends in shaving!